



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,007	04/21/2004	Taylor J. Leaming	02-AU-090 (S2040)	5514
7590 03/06/2008				
Mario Donato, Jr. STMicroelectronics, Inc. 1310 Electronics Dr. Carrollton, TX 75006			EXAMINER UNELUS, ERNEST	
			ART UNIT 2181	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/829,007

Applicant(s)

LEAMING, TAYLOR J.

Examiner

ERNEST UNELUS

Art Unit

2181

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,13-19,22-28 and 31-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,13-19,22-28 and 31-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

Claim rejections based on prior art

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the Maier reference, *“fails to teach all of the recitations of the independent claims as amended, and that the remaining prior art of record fails to properly provide the noted deficiencies”*

This argument is not persuasive because fig. 1 of Maier discloses a bus between the device and the host, as amended by the applicant. With respect to *“based upon allocations of system bus bandwidth to the device communicating with the host device over the system bus”* (see fig. 1, which discloses communication between the device and the host and paragraph 0055 of Maier, which discloses, “in a second enumerating step ENUM2, the USB host enumerates the USB device. As illustrated in FIG. 2, only the descriptors (II) associated to the services (S1, S2, S3) which have been activated and the descriptor associated to the standard service (S0) will be retrieved”. Maier discloses a negotiation flag (see par. 0041), which is being use as a metric. The metric exceeding a threshold is the negotiation flag moving from not active-to-active. As stated in paragraphs (steps) 0042 to 0049, the negotiation flag getting to an active state is exceeding a threshold. See also fig. 2 of Lu, which discloses multiple devices (cards 201cs) communicating with a host device).

INFORMATION CONCERNING OATH/DECLARATION

Oath/Declaration

2. The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in **37 C.F.R. 1.63**.

INFORMATION CONCERNING DRAWINGS

Drawings

3. The applicant's drawings submitted are acceptable for examination purposes.

REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 4-10, 13-19, 22-28, and 31-35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier (US 2005/0251596) in view of Lu et al. (2005/0108571).

6. As per **claims 1, 10, and 28**, Maier discloses "An integrated circuit for a smart card (USB device of fig. 1) and comprising:

a transceiver (input and output device) (see fig. 1 and paragraph 0006, which discloses an interface of the device); and

a processing system for communicating with a host device (**USB host of fig. 1**) over a system bus (**the USB bus , as discloses in fig. 1**) via the input and output device, said processing system for providing at least one default descriptor [**descriptors (I)**] to the host device (see **paragraph 0043**),

cooperating with the host device to perform an enumeration based upon the at least one default descriptor (**paragraph 0043 discloses “in a first enumerating step ENUM1, the USB host will enumerate the USB device. In other words, as illustrated in FIG. 2, the USB host will retrieve from the USB device to the USB host only the descriptors (I) associated to the standard service SO and to the mass storage service S1”**), and

providing at least one alternate descriptor [**descriptors (II)**] to the host device and cooperating with the host device to perform a new enumeration based thereon (**ENUM2, as discloses in paragraph 0055**) [(see **paragraph 0055**)], based upon allocations of system bus bandwidth to the device communicating with the host device over the system bus (see above, which discloses the **negotiation flag and fig. 1, which discloses communication between the device and the host**).

Maier discloses the functionality of the smart card and fail to specifically discloses the structure of the card and more than one other devices.

However, LU discloses smart card to be an integrated circuit having a transceiver, a processor and descriptors. For example, as evidence in para. 0004, Lu discloses, “An example of such a resource-constrained device is the smart card. A smart card is simply a plastic card containing an integrated circuit with some memory and a microprocessor. Typically the memory is restricted to 6K bytes of RAM. It is anticipated that smart card

RAM may increase by a few kilobytes over the next few years. However, it is very likely that memory size will continue to be an obstacle to smart card applications. Most smart cards have 8-bit microprocessors". See also paragraph 0006, which discloses an interface of the card. In regards to "based upon allocations of system bus bandwidth to the device communicating with the host device over the system bus", see fig. 2 of Lu, which discloses multiple devices (cards 201cs) communicating with a host device.

Maier (US 2005/0251596) and Lu et al. (US 2005/0108571) are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of communication between a smart card and a computer.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system comprising a main device and an auxiliary device arranged to cooperate with each other as taught by Maier and an infrastructureless resource-constrained device, for example, a smart card, capable of acting as a full-fledged network node providing secure communication to other nodes on the network and in which the security boundary is located on the infrastructureless resource-constrained device as taught by Lu.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Lu teaches, (**"an infrastructureless resource-constrained device, for example, a smart card, capable of acting as a full-fledged network node providing secure communication to other nodes on the network and in which the security boundary is located on the infrastructureless resource-constrained device. Such infrastructureless resource-constrained devices can easily be adapted so that the resource-constrained device can provide many of the functions traditionally associated with full-fledged network nodes"** (see paragraph 0022).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maier (US 2005/0251596) and Lu et al. (2005/0108571) for the benefit of creating a smart card to communicate with a host to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 10, and 28.

7. As per **claims 4, 13, 22, and 31**, the combination of Maier and Lu discloses “The integrated circuit of claim 1,” [See rejection to claim 1 above] Maier further discloses “wherein the at least one alternate descriptor comprises at least one device descriptor” (see **paragraph 0008**).

8. As per **claims 5, 14, 23, and 32**, the combination of Maier and Lu discloses “The integrated circuit of claim 1,” [See rejection to claim 1 above] Maier further discloses “wherein the at least one alternate descriptor comprises at least one configuration descriptor” (see **paragraph 0009**).

9. As per **claims 6, 15, 24, and 33**, the combination of Maier and Lu discloses “The integrated circuit of claim 1,” [See rejection to claim 1 above] Maier further discloses “wherein the at least one alternate descriptor comprises at least one interface descriptor” (see **paragraph 0010**).

10. As per **claims 7, 16, 25, and 34**, the combination of Maier and Lu discloses “The integrated circuit of claim 1,” [See rejection to claim 1 above] Maier further discloses “wherein

Art Unit: 2181

the at least one alternate descriptor comprises at least one endpoint descriptor” (see paragraph 0011).

11. As per claims 8, 17, and 26, the combination of Maier and Lu discloses “The integrated circuit of claim 1,” [See rejection to claim 1 above] Maier further discloses “comprising at least one memory connected to said processor for storing the at least one default descriptor and the at least one alternate descriptor” (see paragraph 0013).

12. As per claims 9, 18, 27, and 35, the combination of Maier and Lu discloses “The integrated circuit of claim 1,” [See rejection to claim 1 above] LU further discloses “wherein said transceiver comprises a universal serial bus (USB) transceiver” (see paragraph 0005), and wherein said processor operates in a USB mode (see paragraph 0005).

13. As per claim 19, Maier discloses “A smart card system (see fig. 1) comprising: a host device (USB host device in fig. 1) and associated system bus (USB bus , as discloses in fig. 1);

a smart card (USB device of fig. 1) to be read by said smart card adapter and comprising a smart card body and an integrated circuit carried by said smart card body, said integrated circuit comprising

a transceiver (see fig. 1 and paragraph 0006, which discloses an interface of the device), and

a processor for communicating with said host device over said system bus via said transceiver, said processor for providing at least one default descriptor [descriptors (I)] to said host device (see paragraph 0043),

cooperating with said host device to perform an enumeration based upon the at least one default descriptor (paragraph 0043 discloses “in a first enumerating step ENUM1, the USB host will enumerate the USB device. In other words, as illustrated in FIG. 2, the USB host will retrieve from the USB device to the USB host only the descriptors (I) associated to the standard service SO and to the mass storage service S1”), and

responsive to the system event, providing at least one alternate descriptor [descriptors (II)] to the host device and cooperating with the host device to perform a new enumeration based thereon (ENUM2, as discloses in paragraph 0055) [(see paragraph 0055)], based upon allocations of system bus bandwidth to the device communicating with the host device over the system bus (see above, which discloses the negotiation flag and fig. 1, which discloses communication between the device and the host).

Maier discloses the functionality of the smart card and fail to specifically disclose the structure of the card, more than one other device, and a smart card adapter connected to the host.

However, LU discloses a smart card to be an integrated circuit having a transceiver, a processor and descriptors. For example, as evidence in para. 0004, Lu discloses, “An example of such a resource-constrained device is the smart card. A smart card is simply a plastic card containing an integrated circuit with some memory and a microprocessor.

Art Unit: 2181

Typically the memory is restricted to 6K bytes of RAM. It is anticipated that smart card RAM may increase by a few kilobytes over the next few years. However, it is very likely that memory size will continue to be an obstacle to smart card applications. Most smart cards have 8-bit microprocessors". See also paragraph 0006, which discloses an interface of the card. See also paragraph 0086, which discloses "[The smart card reader 215(6b) provides an implementation of the Peer I/O Server 613(6b), described in greater detail herein below. The smart card reader 215(6b) connects to the smart card 201(6b) through an ISO standard half-duplex I/O interface and to a host computer 217(6b) via a standard full-duplex I/O interface 607. Because the smart card reader 215(6b) completely handles the ISO 7816 protocol, and connects to the host computer 217(6b) using standard serial protocol, no additional software, beyond that which is normally found on a PC, is needed on the host PC 217(6b)"]". In regards to "the system utilization metric based upon a number of other devices communicating with the host device", see fig. 2 of Lu, which discloses multiple devices (cards 201cs) communicating with a host device.

Maier (US 2005/0251596) and Lu et al. (US 2005/0108571) are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of communication between a smart card and a computer.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system comprising a main device and an auxiliary device arranged to co-operate with each other as taught by Maier and an infrastructureless resource-constrained device, for example, a smart card, capable of acting as a full-fledged network node providing secure

Art Unit: 2181

communication to other nodes on the network and in which the security boundary is located on the infrastructureless resource-constrained device as taught by Lu.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Lu teaches, (“an **infrastructureless resource-constrained device, for example, a smart card, capable of acting as a full-fledged network node providing secure communication to other nodes on the network and in which the security boundary is located on the infrastructureless resource-constrained device. Such infrastructureless resource-constrained devices can easily be adapted so that the resource-constrained device can provide many of the functions traditionally associated with full-fledged network nodes**” (see paragraph 0022).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maier (US 2005/0251596) and Lu et al. (2005/0108571) for the benefit of creating a smart card to communicate with a host to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

RELEVANT ART CITED BY THE EXAMINER

14. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in the applicant's art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See **MPEP 707.05(c)**.

15. The following reference teaches a USB smart card in communication with a USB host.

U.S. PATENT NUMBER

US 2003/0229745

V. CLOSING COMMENTS

Conclusion

a. STATUS OF CLAIMS IN THE APPLICATION

16. The following is a summary of the treatment and status of all claims in the application as recommended by M.P.E.P. 707.07(i):

a(1) CLAIMS REJECTED IN THE APPLICATION

17. Per the instant office action, claims 1, 4-10, 13-19, 22-28, and 31-35 have received a final action on the merits.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

b. DIRECTION OF FUTURE CORRESPONDENCES

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ernest Unelus whose telephone number is (571) 272-8596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2181


IMPORTANT NOTE

19. If attempts to reach the above noted Examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Alfred Kindred, can be reached at the following telephone number:
Area Code (571) 272-4037.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 27, 2008

Ernest Unelus
Examiner, Art Unit 2181


ALFORD KINDRED
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER